Remarks

Claims 1-4, 6-8, and 10-18 are pending in the application. In the present response, the claims remain unchanged. Accordingly, after entry of the response, Claims 1-4, 6-8, and 10-18 will be pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 6, 10, 11, 15 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art (APA), figure 3, in view of Park et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,355), herein referred to as "Park".

Claims 2-4, 7-8, 12-14, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art (APA), figure 3, in view of Park and further in view of Won (U.S. Patent No. 6,046,785).

Of the above-referenced claims, Claims 1 and 11 are independent. Accordingly, once allowability of those claims are established, all claims depending therefrom are likewise allowable.

In rejecting Claims 1 and 11 the Examiner indicated in paragraph 2 of the Office Action that APA, figure 3, does not disclose first and second protrusions forming on a backside of the received container. Park does disclose a first protrusion (part between frame 82 and PCB 4) can be protruded from a received container (frame structure 82) (see figure 4A) to form an insertion part (e.g., space between PCB 4 and frame 82) and support the driver PCB.

In an interview between Supervisor David Nelms, i.e., Examiner Nguyen's supervisor, and Applicant's representative conducted on March 31, 2008, the subject

matter of at least Claim 1 and the Park reference was discussed and an agreement was reached that "Claim 1 distinguished from the prior art in that the instant invention defines an insertion space defined by protrusions formed on the back side of the support of the printed circuit board in a manner that distinguished it over the prior art of record" (see Interview Summary dated March 31, 2008).

Likewise, Applicants submit that Claim 11 distinguishes over the prior art of record for the reasons noted above in regard to Claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1 and 11, and Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10, and 12-18 depending therefrom are patentable.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Conclusion

In view of the remarks set forth above, it is submitted that the application is no in condition for allowance, notice whereof is respectfully requested of the Examiner. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns, a telephone call to the undersigned at (949) 752-7040 is welcomed and encouraged.

Certification of Facsimile Transmission

I hereby certify that this paper is baing the simile transmitted to the U.S.

Patent and Trademerk Office on the date shown below.

April 8, 2008

Monique M. Butler Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 50,233

Customer No. 32,605